

**REMARKS**

In the office action, claims 1-7 were allowed.

In the office action, claims 18-23 were rejected under 35 USC 112 because "Claim 18 confusingly appears to end in midsentence." Applicant reviewed claim 18 (re-printed above) and found it to be a complete claim ending in a period. Applicant has amended claim 18 to rectify the problem and case claims 18 to 23 to comply with 35 USC 112. This amendment was made for the purposes of form and not for purposes of patentability.

In the office action, claims 8-23 faced a double patenting rejection. A terminal disclaimer and fee are enclosed to address the double patenting rejection.

In the office action, claims 8-14, 16-20, 22 and 23 were rejected as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Logan (6,692,251). Applicant traverses this rejection. Logan states, "Furthermore, the non-imaging optical focusing device 44 may be sized appropriately depending upon the application. For example, a lens having an 8 millimeter cross-sectional diameter at the output 49 may be utilized for small curing applications, whereas a lens having a cross-sectional diameter of 11 millimeters at surface 49 may be utilized for larger applications..." Logan at column 12, lines 56 et al. Logan's non-imaging optical focusing device 44 is NOT a light reflective device, and it does NOT incorporate the particular geometric relationships in a light reflector claimed by Applicant in claims 8, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19 and 21. Logan's only reflective surface is array 32 which is merely the backing on which the LED's are installed, not a separate light reflector as claimed by Applicant. Accordingly, Logan does not anticipate the claims and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection is requested.

In the office action, claims 8-23 were rejected as being obvious in light of a combination of Mills and Doiron. Neither Mills nor Doiron discloses Applicant's claimed a light reflective device, and neither Mills nor Doiron discloses the particular geometric relationships in a light reflector claimed by Applicant in claims 8, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19 and 21. The Examiner cites Doiron for the

principle that wells in which LEDs are located may be reflective, but such disclosure does not teach the separate light reflector claimed by Applicant. In particular, Applicant's claim 8 recites:

a light reflective device installed on said primary heat sink, said light reflective device including  
a proximal side proximal to said semiconductor chip, said proximal side including a light inlet having a dimension "d",  
a distal side distal to said semiconductor chip, said distal side including a light exit having a dimension "a" and an exterior dimension "e", where  $e > a$  and  $a > d$ .

Neither that structure nor its geometry is not found in any of the prior art references. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

In the office action, claims 15 and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Logan. As explained above, Logan fails to disclose all of the elements of the base claim. Further, the range of dimensions in claims 15 and 21 impart particular geometric relationships to the light reflective device to create a particular light footprint. This is not suggested by Logan or any other reference, hence the obviousness rejection is improper. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. If any other fees are due, those fees should be charged to deposit account no. 50-0581.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of June, 2004.



Daniel P. McCarthy  
Reg. No. 36,600  
PARSONS, BEHLE & LATIMER  
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
(801) 532-1234